

Hyperkähler manifolds with torsion obtained from hyperholomorphic bundles

Misha Verbitsky,¹

verbit@maths.gla.ac.uk, verbit@mccme.ru

Abstract

We construct examples of compact hyperkähler manifolds with torsion (HKT manifolds) which are not homogeneous and not locally conformal hyperkähler. Consider a total space T of a tangent bundle over a hyperkähler manifold M . The manifold T is hypercomplex, but it is never hyperkähler, unless M is flat. We show that T admits an HKT-structure. We also prove that a quotient of T by a $\mathbb{Z}$ -action $v \rightarrow q^n v$ is HKT, for any real number $q \in \mathbb{R}$, $q > 1$. This quotient is compact, if M is compact. A more general version of this construction holds for all hyperholomorphic bundles with holonomy in $Sp(n)$.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	The q-Dolbeault bicomplex	3
3	The q-positive forms	7
4	Hyperholomorphic bundles	9
5	$\mathbb{H}$-hyperholomorphic bundles	10
6	The Obata connection on $\text{Tot } B$.	10
7	HKT-structure on $\text{Tot } B$.	12
8	New examples of compact HKT-manifolds	14

¹The author is partially supported by CRDF grant RM1-2354-MO02 and EPSRC grant GR/R77773/01

1 Introduction

Hyperkähler manifolds with torsion (HKT-manifolds) were introduced by P.S.Howe and G.Papadopoulos ([HP]) and much discussed in physics literature since then. For an excellent survey of these works written from a mathematician's point of view, the reader is referred to the paper of G. Grantcharov and Y. S. Poon [GP]. In physics, HKT-manifolds appear as moduli of brane solitons in supergravity and M-theory ([GP2], [P]). HKT-manifolds also arise as moduli space of some special black holes in N=2 supergravity ([GP1], [GPS]).

The term “hyperkähler manifold with torsion” is actually quite misleading, because an HKT-manifold is not hyperkähler. This is why we prefer to use the abbreviation “HKT-manifold”.

HKT-manifolds are hypercomplex manifolds equipped with a special kind of Riemannian metrics.

A **hypercomplex manifold** ([Bo]) is a C^∞ -manifold M endowed with a triple of almost complex structures $I, J, K \in \text{End}(TM)$ which are integrable and satisfy the quaternionic relations $I \circ J = -J \circ I = K$. If, in addition, M is equipped with a Riemannian structure g preserved by I, J, K , then M is called **hypercomplex Hermitian**. If (M, g) is Kähler with respect to I, J, K , then (M, g, I, J, K) is called **hyperkähler**.

An HKT-manifold is a hypercomplex Hermitian manifold which satisfies a similar, but weaker condition (1.1).

Let (M, g, I, J, K) be a hypercomplex Hermitian manifold. Write the standard Hermitian forms on M as follows:

$$\omega_I := g(\cdot, I\cdot), \quad \omega_J := g(\cdot, J\cdot), \quad \omega_K := g(\cdot, K\cdot).$$

By definition, M is hyperkähler iff these forms are closed. The HKT condition is weaker:

$$\partial(\omega_J + \sqrt{-1} \omega_K) = 0. \tag{1.1}$$

Notice that $\Omega = \frac{1}{2}(\omega_J + \sqrt{-1} \omega_K)$ is a $(2, 0)$ -form, for any hypercomplex Hermitian manifold, as an elementary linear-algebraic calculation insures. This form is called **the canonical $(2, 0)$ -form associated with the hypercomplex Hermitian structure**. As we shall see (Proposition 3.2), the metric can be recovered from the hypercomplex structure and the form Ω .

Originally, the HKT-manifolds were defined in terms of a quaternionic invariant connection with totally antisymmetric torsion (see [HP], [GP]).

Many homogeneous examples of compact HKT-manifolds were obtained in [HP] and [GP]. In [I] it was shown that any locally conformally hyperkähler manifold also admits an HKT-structure (see [Or]).

Locally, the HKT metrics can be studied using potential functions ([GP]) in the same fashion as one uses plurisubharmonic functions to study Kähler metrics. This way one obtains many examples of HKT-structures on a sufficiently small open hypercomplex manifolds.

If $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} M = 4$, every hypercomplex Hermitian metrics is also HKT (the condition (1.1) is satisfied vacuously because the left hand side of (1.1) is a $(3, 0)$ -form).

If $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} M > 4$, the HKT-condition becomes highly non-trivial. There are examples of hypercomplex manifolds not admitting an HKT-structure ([FG]). All known examples of compact HKT-manifolds are either homogeneous or locally conformally hyperkähler.

In the present paper, we construct HKT-structures on fibered spaces associated with hyperkähler manifolds. A typical example of our construction is the following

Theorem 1.1: Let M be a hyperkähler manifold and

$$T^{\circ}M = \text{Tot}(TM) \setminus \{\text{zero section}\}$$

the total space of non-zero vectors in TM . Given $q \in \mathbb{R}$, $|q| \neq 1$, let $\sim_q$ be the equivalence relation generated by $x \sim_q qx$, $x \in TM$. Consider the quotient $T^{\circ}M / \sim_q$. Then $T^{\circ}M / \sim_q$ is equipped with a natural HKT-structure.

Proof: See Theorem 8.1. ■

Theorem 1.1 is a special case of a much more general construction performed in Section 8.

2 The q -Dolbeault bicomplex

In this Section, we introduce some notions of quaternionic linear algebra which will be used further on. A reader well versed in quaternions can safely skip this section. We follow [V5].

Let M be a hypercomplex manifold, and

$$\Lambda^0 M \xrightarrow{d} \Lambda^1 M \xrightarrow{d} \Lambda^2 M \xrightarrow{d} \dots$$

its de Rham complex. Consider the natural action of $SU(2)$ on $\Lambda^* M$. Clearly, $SU(2)$ acts on $\Lambda^i M$, $i \leq \frac{1}{2} \dim_{\mathbb{R}} M$ with weights $i, i-2, i-4, \dots$

We denote by Λ_+^i the maximal $SU(2)$ -subspace of Λ^i , on which $SU(2)$ acts with weight i .

The following linear-algebraic lemma allows one to compute Λ_+^i explicitly

Lemma 2.1: In the above assumptions, let I be an induced complex structure, and $\mathbb{H}_I$ the quaternion space, considered as a 2-dimensional complex vector space with the complex structure induced by I . Denote by $\Lambda_I^{p,0}(M)$ the space of $(p,0)$ -forms on (M, I) . The space $\mathbb{H}_I$ is equipped with a natural action of $SU(2)$. Consider $\Lambda_I^{p,0}(M)$ as a representation of $SU(2)$, with trivial group action. Then, there is a canonical isomorphism

$$\Lambda_+^p(M) \cong S_{\mathbb{C}}^p \mathbb{H}_I \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \Lambda_I^{p,0}(M), \quad (2.1)$$

where $S_{\mathbb{C}}^p \mathbb{H}_I$ denotes a p -th symmetric power of $\mathbb{H}_I$. Moreover, the $SU(2)$ -action on $\Lambda_+^p(M)$ is compatible with the isomorphism (2.1).

Proof: This is [V5], Lemma 8.1. ■

Consider an $SU(2)$ -invariant decomposition

$$\Lambda^p(M) = \Lambda_+^p(M) \oplus V^p, \quad (2.2)$$

where V^p is the sum of all $SU(2)$ -subspaces of $\Lambda^p(M)$ of weight less than p . Using the decomposition (2.2), we define the quaternionic Dolbeault differential $d_+ : \Lambda_+^*(M) \rightarrow \Lambda_+^*(M)$ as a composition of de Rham differential and projection of to $\Lambda_+^*(M) \subset \Lambda^*(M)$. Since the de Rham differential cannot increase the $SU(2)$ -weight of a form more than by 1, d preserves the subspace $V^* \subset \Lambda^*(M)$. Therefore, d_+ is a differential in $\Lambda_+^*(M)$.

Let M be a hypercomplex manifold, and I an induced complex structure. Consider the operator $\mathcal{I} : \Lambda^*(M) \rightarrow \Lambda^*(M)$ mapping a (p,q) -form η to $\sqrt{-1}(p-q)\eta$. By definition, $\mathcal{I}$ belongs to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ acting on $\Lambda^*(M)$ in the standard way. Therefore, $\mathcal{I}$ preserves the subspace $\Lambda_+^*(M) \subset \Lambda^*(M)$. We obtain the Hodge decomposition

$$\Lambda_+^*(M) = \oplus_{p,q} \Lambda_{+,I}^{p,q}(M).$$

Let M be a hypercomplex manifold, I an induced complex structure, and $I, J, K \in \mathbb{H}$ the standard triple of induced complex structures. Clearly, J acts on the complexified co tangent space $\Lambda^1 M \otimes \mathbb{C}$ mapping $\Lambda_I^{0,1}(M)$ to $\Lambda_I^{1,0}(M)$. Consider a differential operator

$$\partial_J : C^\infty(M) \longrightarrow \Lambda_I^{1,0}(M),$$

mapping f to $J(\bar{\partial}f)$, where $\bar{\partial} : C^\infty(M) \longrightarrow \Lambda_I^{0,1}(M)$ is the standard Dolbeault differential on a Kähler manifold (M, I) . We extend ∂_J to a differential

$$\partial_J : \Lambda_I^{p,0}(M) \longrightarrow \Lambda_I^{p+1,0}(M),$$

using the Leibniz rule.

Proposition 2.2: Let M be a hypercomplex manifold, I an induced complex structure, I, J, K the standard basis in quaternion algebra, and

$$\Lambda_+^*(M) = \oplus_{p,q} \Lambda_{I,+}^{p,q}(M)$$

the Hodge decomposition of the quaternionic Dolbeault complex. Then there exists a canonical isomorphism

$$\Lambda_{I,+}^{p,q}(M) \cong \Lambda_I^{p+q,0}(M). \quad (2.3)$$

Under this identification, the quaternionic Dolbeault differential

$$d_+ : \Lambda_{I,+}^{p,q}(M) \longrightarrow \Lambda_{I,+}^{p+1,q}(M) \oplus \Lambda_{I,+}^{p,q+1}(M)$$

corresponds to a sum

$$\partial \oplus \partial_J : \Lambda_I^{p+q,0}(M) \longrightarrow \Lambda_I^{p+q+1,0}(M) \oplus \Lambda_I^{p+q+1,0}(M).$$

Proof: This is Proposition 8.13 of [V5]. ■

The statement of Proposition 2.2 can be represented by the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\Lambda_+^0(M) & & \Lambda_I^{0,0}(M) \\
\swarrow d'_+ \quad \searrow d''_+ & & \swarrow \partial \quad \searrow \partial_J \\
\Lambda_+^{1,0}(M) \quad \Lambda_+^{0,1}(M) & \cong & \Lambda_I^{1,0}(M) \quad \Lambda_I^{1,0}(M) \\
\swarrow d'_+ \quad \searrow d''_+ \quad \swarrow d'_+ \quad \searrow d''_+ & & \swarrow \partial \quad \searrow \partial_J \quad \swarrow \partial \quad \searrow \partial_J \\
\Lambda_+^{2,0}(M) \quad \Lambda_+^{1,1}(M) \quad \Lambda_+^{0,2}(M) & & \Lambda_I^{2,0}(M) \quad \Lambda_I^{2,0}(M) \quad \Lambda_I^{2,0}(M)
\end{array} \tag{2.4}$$

where $d_+ = d'_+ + d''_+$ is the Hodge decomposition of the quaternionic Dolbeault differential.

Using the $SU(2)$ -action, we may identify the bundles $\Lambda_+^{p,q}(M)$ with $\Lambda_+^{p+q,0}(M) = \Lambda_I^{p+q,0}(M)$ explicitly, as follows.

Let $\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K}$ be the Lie algebra operators acting on differential forms and associated with J, K in the same way as $\mathcal{I}$ is associated with I . Consider the map $\mathcal{R} : \Lambda^*(M) \longrightarrow \Lambda^*(M)$,

$$\mathcal{R} := \frac{\mathcal{J} - \sqrt{-1}\mathcal{K}}{2}. \tag{2.5}$$

It is easy to check that the Lie algebra elements $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{I}, \overline{\mathcal{R}}$ form an $SL(2)$ -triple in the complexification of the standard $SU(2) \subset \text{End}(\Lambda^*(M))$. Therefore, $\mathcal{R}$ maps $\Lambda_+^{p,q}(M)$ to $\Lambda_+^{p+1,q-1}(M)$. Since $\Lambda_+^m(M)$ is a representation of weight m , $\mathcal{R}$ induces an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{R} : \Lambda_{+,I}^{p,q}(M) \longrightarrow \Lambda_{+,I}^{p+1,q-1}(M),$$

for all $q > 0$.

Together with (2.4), this observation implies the following.

Claim 2.3: Let M be a hypercomplex manifold, I an induced complex structure, and $\eta \in \Lambda_I^{1,1}(M)$ a $(1,1)$ -form. Then η is $SU(2)$ -invariant if and only if $\mathcal{R}(\eta) = 0$. Moreover, for all functions ψ on M , we have

$$\mathcal{R}(\partial\bar{\partial}(\psi)) = \partial\partial_J(\psi).$$

■

Assume now that the manifold M is hypercomplex Hermitian. Consider the 3-dimensional space generated by the 2-forms ω_I , ω_J and ω_K . This is a weight 2 representation of $SU(2)$. Moreover, that

$$\mathcal{R}(\omega_I) = \Omega, \quad (2.6)$$

where $\Omega = \frac{1}{2}(\omega_J + \sqrt{-1}\omega_K)$ is the canonical $(2,0)$ -form.

3 The q -positive forms

Let M be a hypercomplex manifold, and $\Lambda_I^{p,q}(M)$ the bundle of (p,q) -forms on (M, I) . Consider the map $J : \Lambda^*(M) \longrightarrow \Lambda^*(M)$,

$$J(dx_1 \wedge dx_2 \wedge \dots) = J(dx_1) \wedge J(dx_2) \wedge \dots$$

Clearly, on 2-forms we have $J^2 = 1$; more generally,

$$\left(J \Big|_{\Lambda^{\text{even}}(M)} \right)^2 = 1. \quad (3.1)$$

Since J and I anticommute, we have $J(\Lambda_I^{p,q}(M)) = \Lambda_I^{q,p}(M)$. By (3.1), the map $\eta \longrightarrow J(\bar{\eta})$ defines a real structure on $\Lambda_I^{2,0}(M)$.

Definition 3.1: Let $\eta \in \Lambda_I^{2,0}(M)$ be a $(2,0)$ -form on a hypercomplex manifold M . We say that η is q -real if $\eta = J(\bar{\eta})$. We say that η is q -positive if η is q -real, and

$$\eta(v, J(\bar{v})) \geq 0 \quad (3.2)$$

for any $v \in T_I^{1,0}(M)$. We say that η is **strictly q -positive** if the inequality (3.2) is strict, for all $v \neq 0$.

The q -positive forms were introduced and studied at some length in [V4], under the name “ K -positive forms”. These forms were used to study the stability of certain coherent sheaves. Some properties of q -positive forms are remarkably close to that of the usual positive forms, studied in algebraic geometry in connection with Vanishing Theorems.

Proposition 3.2: Let M be a hypercomplex manifold, and h a hypercomplex Hermitian metric. Consider the form

$$\Omega := \omega_J + \sqrt{-1}\omega_K$$

(see (1.1)). Then Ω is strictly q -positive. Conversely, every strictly q -positive $(2,0)$ -form is obtained from a unique hypercomplex Hermitian metric on M .

Proof: The form $\Omega := \omega_J + \sqrt{-1} \omega_K$ is q -positive as an elementary calculation insures. Indeed, write the orthonormal basis $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{2n} \in \Lambda^{1,0}(M)$ in such a way that

$$J(\xi_{2i-1}) = \bar{\xi}_{2i}, \quad J(\xi_{2i}) = -\bar{\xi}_{2i-1}. \quad (3.3)$$

Then

$$\Omega = \xi_1 \wedge \xi_2 + \xi_3 \wedge \xi_4 + \dots \quad (3.4)$$

This form is clearly q -real and strictly q -positive.

Conversely, let Ω be a q -real and strictly q -positive form on a hypercomplex manifold M . We can write Ω in coordinates as

$$\Omega = \alpha_1 \xi_1 \wedge \xi_2 + \alpha_3 \xi_3 \wedge \xi_4 + \dots$$

where α_i are positive real numbers, and ξ_i satisfy (3.3).

Write a hypercomplex Hermitian form h as

$$\begin{aligned} h = & \alpha_1 ((\operatorname{Re} \xi_1)^2 + (\operatorname{Im} \xi_1)^2 + (\operatorname{Re} \xi_2)^2 + (\operatorname{Im} \xi_2)^2) \\ & + \alpha_3 ((\operatorname{Re} \xi_3)^2 + (\operatorname{Im} \xi_3)^2 + (\operatorname{Re} \xi_4)^2 + (\operatorname{Im} \xi_4)^2) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Clearly, the corresponding canonical $(2, 0)$ -form is equal Ω .

The Hermitian metric (3.5) can be reconstructed from Ω directly as follows:

$$h(x, y) = \Omega(x^{1,0}, J(y^{0,1})),$$

for all $x, y \in T_{\mathbb{R}}M$, where $x^{1,0}$, $y^{0,1}$ denotes the $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ -parts of x , y . We proved that the hypercomplex Hermitian structure is uniquely determined by the strictly q -positive form Ω . ■

The following Corollary gives an interpretation of HKT-structures in terms of the canonical $(2, 0)$ -form.

Corollary 3.3: Let M be a hypercomplex manifold, and $\Omega \in \Lambda^{2,0}_c(M)$ a ∂ -closed strictly q -positive $(2, 0)$ -form. Then M is an HKT-manifold, and Ω is obtained as a canonical $(2, 0)$ -form of an HKT-metric h . Moreover, h is uniquely determined by Ω .

Proof: By Proposition 3.2, $\Omega = \omega_J + \sqrt{-1} \omega_K$, for some hypercomplex Hermitian metric h . Since $\partial\Omega = 0$, (M, h) is an HKT-manifold. ■

4 Hyperholomorphic bundles

Hyperholomorphic bundles were introduced and studied at some length in [V1]. Let B be a holomorphic vector bundle over a complex manifold X , ∇ a connection in B and $\Theta \in \Lambda^2 \otimes \text{End}(B)$ be its curvature. This connection is called **compatible with the holomorphic structure** if $\nabla_\gamma(\zeta) = 0$ for any holomorphic section ζ and any antiholomorphic tangent vector field $\gamma \in T^{0,1}(X)$. If there exists a holomorphic structure compatible with the given Hermitian connection then this connection is called **integrable**.

Theorem 4.1: Let ∇ be a Hermitian connection in a complex vector bundle B over a complex manifold X . Then ∇ is integrable if and only if $\Theta \in \Lambda^{1,1}(X, \text{End}(B))$, where $\Lambda^{1,1}(X, \text{End}(B))$ denotes the forms of Hodge type $(1,1)$. Also, the holomorphic structure compatible with ∇ is unique.

Proof: This is Proposition 4.17 of [Kob], Chapter I. ■

This proposition is a version of Newlander-Nirenberg theorem. For vector bundles, it was proven by M. Atiyah and R. Bott.

Definition 4.2: Let B be a Hermitian vector bundle with a connection ∇ over a hypercomplex manifold M . Then ∇ is called **hyperholomorphic** if ∇ is integrable with respect to each of the complex structures induced by the hypercomplex structure.

As follows from Theorem 4.1, ∇ is hyperholomorphic if and only if its curvature Θ is of Hodge type $(1,1)$ with respect to any of the complex structures induced by a hypercomplex structure.

An easy calculation shows that ∇ is hyperholomorphic if and only if Θ is an $SU(2)$ -invariant differential form.

Hyperholomorphic bundles are quite ubiquitous. Clearly, the tangent bundle to a hyperkähler manifold and all its tensor powers are hyperholomorphic. There are many other examples

Example 4.3: Let M be a compact hyperkähler manifold, B a holomorphic bundle. Then B admits a unique hyperholomorphic connection, if B is stable and the cohomology classes $c_1(B)$ and $c_2(B)$ are $SU(2)$ -invariant. Moreover, if M is generic in its deformation class, then all stable bundles admit a hyperholomorphic connection.

5 $\mathbb{H}$ -hyperholomorphic bundles

Definition 5.1: Let M be a hypercomplex manifold, and (B, ∇) a hyperholomorphic bundle on M , $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} B = 2n$. The bundle B is called **$\mathbb{H}$ -hyperholomorphic** if ∇ preserves a $\mathbb{C}$ -linear symplectic structure on B . In other words, B is **$\mathbb{H}$ -hyperholomorphic** if the holonomy of ∇ is contained in $Sp(n)$.

The following examples are obvious.

Example 5.2: Let F be a hyperholomorphic bundle on M . Then $F \oplus F^*$ is $\mathbb{H}$ -hyperholomorphic.

Example 5.3: Consider the tangent bundle TM on M . Assume that M is hyperkähler. Then TM is $\mathbb{H}$ -hyperholomorphic.

The main property of $\mathbb{H}$ -hyperholomorphic bundles is the following.

Claim 5.4: Let M be a hyperkähler manifold, and B an $\mathbb{H}$ -hyperholomorphic bundle. Denote by $\text{Tot } B$ the total space of B . Then $\text{Tot } B$ is equipped with a natural hypercomplex structure. In particular, the total space of TM is hypercomplex.

Proof: Since the holonomy of B is contained in $Sp(n)$, there is a natural parallel action of $\mathbb{H}$ on B . Given a quaternion $L \in \mathbb{H}$, $L^2 = -1$, consider B as a complex vector bundle with the complex structure defined by L . Denote this complex vector bundle as (B, L) . Since the curvature of B is $SU(2)$ -invariant, the bundle (B, L) is hyperholomorphic. Consider (B, L) as a holomorphic vector bundle on (M, L) . Denote the corresponding complex structure on $\text{Tot } B$ by L . We obtained an integrable complex structure on $\text{Tot } B$ for each quaternion $L \in \mathbb{H}$, $L^2 = -1$. It is easy to check that these complex structures satisfy quaternionic relations, inducing a hypercomplex structure on $\text{Tot } B$. ■

6 The Obata connection on $\text{Tot } B$.

Let M be a hyperkähler manifold, and B an $\mathbb{H}$ -hyperholomorphic bundle. By Claim 5.4, the total space $\text{Tot } B$ is hypercomplex. One can ask whether

this hypercomplex structure is hyperkähler. The answer is - never (unless B is flat).

Given a hypercomplex manifold, one can easily establish whether M admits a hyperkähler structure. This is done most easily using the so-called Obata connection.

Theorem 6.1: (Obata) Let M be a hypercomplex manifold. Then M admits a unique torsion-free connection which preserves the hypercomplex structure.¹

Proof: Well known (see [Ob]). ■

If M is hyperkähler, then the Levi-Civita connection preserves the hypercomplex structure. In this case, the Levi-Civita connection coincides with the Obata connection.

To determine whether a hypercomplex manifold M admits a hyperkähler structure, one needs to compute the holonomy of the Obata connection. The manifold is hyperkähler if and only if the holonomy Hol preserves a metric; that is, M is hyperkähler if and only if Hol is contained in $Sp(n)$.

Proposition 6.2: Let M be a hyperkähler manifold, B an $\mathbb{H}$ -hyperholomorphic bundle, and $Tot B$ its total space considered as a hypercomplex manifold (see Claim 5.4). Assume that the curvature of B is non-zero. Then $Tot B$ does not admit a hyperkähler structure.

Proof: One could compute the holonomy group of the Obata connection of $Tot B$, and show that it is non-compact. To avoid excessive computations, we use a less straightforward argument.

Suppose that $Tot B$ is hyperkähler. Given $m \in M$, let $B_m \subset Tot B$ be the fiber of B in m . By construction, B_m is a hypercomplex submanifold in $Tot B$. Such submanifolds are called **trianalytic** (see [V2], [V3] for a study of trianalytic cycles on hyperkähler manifolds). In [V3], it was shown that trianalytic submanifolds are completely geodesic. In other words, for any trianalytic submanifold $Z \subset X$, the Levi-Civita connection on $TX|_Z$

¹This connection is called the Obata connection.

preserves the orthogonal decomposition

$$TX|_Z = TZ \oplus TZ^\perp \quad (6.1)$$

If we have a hypercomplex fibration $X \longrightarrow Y$, the decomposition (6.1) gives a connection for this fibration. In [V3] it was shown that this connection is flat, for any hyperkähler fibration.

We obtain a flat connection ∇ in the fibration $\text{Tot } B \longrightarrow M$. This connection is clearly compatible with the additive structure on the bundle B . Therefore, ∇ is an affine connection on B . By construction, ∇ is compatible with the hypercomplex structure on $\text{Tot } B$. Therefore, ∇ coincides with the hyperholomorphic connection on B . We proved that B is flat. ■

7 HKT-structure on $\text{Tot } B$.

Let M be a smooth manifold. Given a bundle with connection on M , we have a decomposition

$$T \text{Tot } B = T_{ver} \oplus T_{hor} \quad (7.1)$$

of the tangent space to $\text{Tot } B$ into horizontal and vertical components. Clearly, the bundle T_{ver} is identified with π^*B , and T_{hor} with π^*TM , where $\pi : \text{Tot } B \longrightarrow M$ is the standard projection.

Assume now that M is a Riemannian manifold, and B a vector bundle, equipped with a Euclidean metric. Then $\text{Tot } B$ is equipped with a Riemannian metric g defined by the following conditions.

- (i) The decomposition $T \text{Tot } B = T_{ver} \oplus T_{hor}$ is orthogonal with respect to g .
- (ii) Under the natural identification $T_{ver} \cong \pi^*B$, the metric g restricted to T_{ver} becomes the metric on B .
- (iii) The metric g restricted to $T_{hor} \cong \pi^*TM$ is equal to the metric induced on π^*TM from the Riemannian structure on M .

Definition 7.1: In the above assumptions, the metric g is called **the natural metric on $\text{Tot } B$ induced by the connection and the metrics on M and B .**

Notice that the metric g depends from the metrics on B and M and from the connection in B . Different connections induce different metrics on $\text{Tot } B$.

Theorem 7.2: Let M be an HKT-manifold, and B an $\mathbb{H}$ -hyperholomorphic vector bundle on M . Consider the metric g on $\text{Tot } B$ defined as in Definition 7.1. Then g is an HKT-metric.

Proof: Consider the decomposition $g = \pi^*g_M + \pi^*g_B$ of the metric g onto the horizontal and vertical components. Since the decomposition $T \text{Tot } B = T_{\text{ver}} \oplus T_{\text{hor}}$ is compatible with the hypercomplex structure, the 2-forms $g_{\text{hor}} := \pi^*g_M$ and $g_{\text{ver}} := \pi^*g_B$ are $SU(2)$ -invariant. Consider the corresponding (2,0)-forms Ω_{hor} and Ω_{ver} obtained as in (1.1);

$$\Omega_{\text{hor}} = \omega_{J_{\text{hor}}} + \sqrt{-1} \omega_{K_{\text{hor}}}$$

where $\omega_{J_{\text{hor}}} = g_{\text{hor}}(J\cdot, \cdot)$, $\omega_{K_{\text{hor}}} = g_{\text{hor}}(K\cdot, \cdot)$ are differential forms associated with g_{hor} and J, K as in (1.1).

Then Ω_{hor} and Ω_{ver} are horizontal and vertical components of the standard (2,0)-form of $\text{Tot } B$:

$$\Omega = \Omega_{\text{hor}} + \Omega_{\text{ver}} \quad (7.2)$$

The HKT condition can be written as $\partial\Omega = 0$ (1.1). Let Ω_M be the standard (2,0)-form of M . Since M is an HKT manifold, (1.1) holds on M and the form Ω_{hor} satisfies

$$\partial\Omega_{\text{hor}} = \partial\pi^*\Omega_M = 0.$$

To prove Theorem 7.2, it remains to show

$$\partial\Omega_{\text{ver}} = 0 \quad (7.3)$$

Consider a function

$$\Psi : \text{Tot } B \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \Psi(v) = |v|^2, \quad (7.4)$$

mapping a vector $v \in TM$ to the square of its norm. Let

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega^{1,0} \xrightarrow{\partial, \partial_J} \Omega^{2,0} \xrightarrow{\partial, \partial_J} \Omega^{3,0} \xrightarrow{\partial, \partial_J} \dots$$

be the bicomplex defined in (2.4). To prove (7.3), and hence Theorem 7.2, it suffices to prove

$$\partial\partial_J\Psi = \Omega_{\text{ver}}. \quad (7.5)$$

By Claim 2.3, we have

$$\partial\partial_J\Psi = \mathcal{R}(\partial\bar{\partial}\Psi),$$

where $R : \Lambda^{1,1}(\text{Tot } B) \longrightarrow \Lambda^{2,0}(\text{Tot } B)$ is the operator

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{\mathcal{J} - \sqrt{-1}\mathcal{K}}{2}$$

(see (2.5)). However, the 2-form $\partial\bar{\partial}\Psi$ is quite easy to compute. From [Bes], (15.19), we obtain:

$$\partial\bar{\partial}\Psi = \omega_{ver} + \xi, \quad (7.6)$$

where $\omega_{ver} = g_{ver}(\cdot, I\cdot)$ is the Hermitian form of g_{ver} , and ξ is defined as following. Using the decomposition (7.1), we consider $\Lambda^2 T_{hor}$ as a subbundle in $\Lambda^2 \text{Tot } B$. Then $\xi \in \Lambda^2 T_{hor} \subset \Lambda^2 \text{Tot } B$ is a 2-form on T_{hor} mapping a pair of vectors (x, y)

$$\begin{aligned} x, y \in T_{hor} \Big|_{(m,b)} &\subset T_{(m,b)} \text{Tot } B, \\ T_{hor} \Big|_{(m,b)} &= T_m M, \\ (m, b) \in \text{Tot } B, m \in M, b \in B \Big|_m \end{aligned}$$

to $(R(x, y, b)\bar{b})$, where $R \in \Lambda^2 M \otimes \text{End } B$ is the curvature of B . The form ξ is $SU(2)$ -invariant because the curvature of B is $SU(2)$ -invariant. Therefore, $\mathcal{R}(\xi) = 0$ (Claim 2.3), and

$$\partial\partial_J\Psi = \mathcal{R}(\partial\bar{\partial}\Psi) = \mathcal{R}(\omega_{ver}) = \Omega_{ver} \quad (7.7)$$

(the last equation holds by (2.6)). This proves (7.5). Theorem 7.2 is proven. $\blacksquare$

8 New examples of compact HKT-manifolds

Let M be a compact HKT-manifold, e.g. a hyperkähler manifold, and B an $\mathbb{H}$ -hyperholomorphic vector bundle on M (for examples of $\mathbb{H}$ -hyperholomorphic vector bundles see Example 5.2 and Example 5.3). Denote by $\text{Tot}^\circ B$ be the space of non-zero vectors in B . Fix a real number $q > 1$. Consider the map

$$\rho_q : \text{Tot}^\circ B \longrightarrow \text{Tot}^\circ B, \quad \rho_q(b) = qb, \quad b \in \text{Tot}^\circ B,$$

and let $\mathcal{M} = \text{Tot}^\circ B / \rho_q$ be the corresponding quotient space. Since the map $b \longrightarrow qb$ is compatible with the hypercomplex structure, the space $\mathcal{M}$

is hypercomplex. It is fibered over a compact manifold M , with fibers Hopf manifolds which are homeomorphic to $S^1 \times S^{2m-1}$, $m = \dim_{\mathbb{R}} B$, hence it is compact.

Theorem 8.1: In the above assumptions, $\mathcal{M}$ admits a natural HKT-structure.

Proof: By Corollary 3.3, we need to construct a q -positive ∂ -closed $(2,0)$ -form on $\mathcal{M}$. Let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be a $(2,0)$ -form on $\text{Tot}^\circ B$,

$$\tilde{\Omega} = \pi^* \Omega_M + \partial \partial_J \log \Psi,$$

where $\pi^* \Omega_M$ is the canonical $(2,0)$ -form on M lifted to $\text{Tot}^\circ B$, and $\Psi : \text{Tot} B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the square norm function (7.4). The map $v \xrightarrow{\rho_q} qv$ satisfies $\rho_q^* \log \Psi = \log \Psi + \log q^2$, and therefore

$$\rho_q^* \partial \partial_J \log \Psi = \partial \partial_J \log \Psi.$$

This implies that $\tilde{\Omega} = \pi^* \Omega_M + \partial \partial_J \log \Psi$ is ρ_q -invariant, hence defines a form Ω on $\mathcal{M} = \text{Tot}^\circ B / \rho_q$.

By construction, the form Ω is ∂ -closed. To prove Theorem 8.1, it remains to show that $\tilde{\Omega}$ is strictly q -positive. We use the same argument as used to show that a locally conformal hyperkähler manifold is HKT.

We have

$$\partial \partial_J \log \Psi = \frac{\partial \partial_J \Psi}{\Psi} - \frac{\partial \Psi \wedge \partial_J \Psi}{\Psi^2}. \quad (8.1)$$

In all directions orthogonal to $\partial \Psi, \partial_J \Psi$, the form $\partial \partial_J \log \Psi$ is proportional to $\partial \partial_J \Psi$, hence q -positive by (7.7). Moreover, (8.1) implies that

$$\tilde{\Omega} = \Omega_{hor} + \frac{\Omega_{ver}}{\Psi} - \frac{\partial \Psi \wedge \partial_J \Psi}{\Psi^2},$$

(we use the notation introduced in Section 7). The form $\Omega_{hor} + \frac{\Omega_{ver}}{\Psi}$ is strictly q -positive (Theorem 7.2). The vertical and the horizontal tangent vectors are orthogonal with respect to $\tilde{\Omega}$. Since $\frac{\partial \Psi \wedge \partial_J \Psi}{\Psi^2}$ vanishes on all horizontal tangent vectors, it remains to prove that $\tilde{\Omega}(x, J\bar{x}) > 0$, where x is vertical.

Let $\xi \in T^{1,0}(\text{Tot}^\circ B)$ be the vertical tangent vector to $\text{Tot}^\circ B$ which is dual to $\frac{d\Psi}{\sqrt{\Psi}}$. Clearly, $\partial \Psi$ is the $(1,0)$ -part of ξ . For all $x \in T^{1,0}(\text{Tot}^\circ B)$, we have

$$\frac{\partial \Psi \wedge \partial_J \Psi}{\Psi^2} \left(x, J(\bar{x}) \right) = (\xi, x)_H^2,$$

where $(\cdot, \cdot)_H$ denotes the Riemannian form. Similarly,

$$\Omega_{ver}(x, J(\bar{x})) = 2(x, x)_H$$

(this can be checked by writing Ω_{ver} in coordinates as in (3.4)). Using Cauchy inequality and $|\xi| = 1$, we obtain $(x, x)_H \geq (\xi, x)_H^2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Omega}(x, J(\bar{x})) &= \frac{\Omega_{ver}}{\Psi} \left(x, J(\bar{x}) \right) - \frac{\partial \Psi \wedge \partial_J \Psi}{\Psi^2} \left(x, J(\bar{x}) \right) \\ &= 2 \frac{(x, x)_H}{\Psi} - \frac{(\xi, x)_H^2}{\Psi} \geq \frac{(x, x)_H}{\Psi} > 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all vertical tangent vectors $x \neq 0$. This proves Theorem 8.1. ■

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to G. Grantcharov, D. Kaledin and Y.-S. Poon for interesting discussions.

References

- [Bes] Besse, A., *Einstein Manifolds*, Springer-Verlag, New York (1987)
- [Bo] Boyer, Charles P. *A note on hyper-Hermitian four-manifolds*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 102 (1988), no. 1, 157–164.
- [Ca] Calabi, E., *Metriques kähleriennes et fibrès holomorphes*, Ann. Ecol. Norm. Sup. **12** (1979), 269–294.
- [FG] Fino, A., Grantcharov, G., *On some properties of the manifolds with skew-symmetric torsion and holonomy $SU(n)$ and $Sp(n)$* , math.DG/0302358, 11 pages.
- [GP] Grantcharov, G., Poon, Y. S., *Geometry of hyper-Kähler connections with torsion*, Comm. Math. Phys. 213 (2000), no. 1, 19–37.
- [GH] Griffiths, Ph., Harris, J., *Principles of Algebraic Geometry*, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1978.
- [GP1] Gutowski, J., Papadopoulos, G. *The Dynamics of Very Special Black Holes*, Phys. Lett. B472 (2000) 45–53
- [GP2] Gutowski, J., Papadopoulos, G. *The Moduli Spaces of Worldvolume Brane Solitons*, Phys. Lett. B432 (1998) 97–102.
- [GPS] G.W. Gibbons, G. Papadopoulos, K.S. Stelle, *HKT and OKT Geometries on Soliton Black Hole Moduli Spaces*, Nucl.Phys. B508 (1997) 623–658
- [HP] Howe, P. S. Papadopoulos, G., *Twistor spaces for hyper-Kähler manifolds with torsion* Phys. Lett. B 379 (1996), no. 1–4, 80–86.

- [I] Ivanov, Stefan, *Geometry of Quaternionic Kähler connections with torsion*, math.DG/0003214, also published in J. Geom. Phys. 41 (2002) 235-257
- [J] Joyce, Dominic, *Compact hypercomplex and quaternionic manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. **35** (1992) no. 3, 743-761
- [Kob] Kobayashi S., *Differential geometry of complex vector bundles*, // Princeton University Press, 1987.
- [Ob] Obata, M., *Affine connections on manifolds with almost complex, quaternionic or Hermitian structure*, Jap. J. Math., 26 (1955), 43-79.
- [Or] Ornea, L., *Weyl structures on quaternionic manifolds. A state of the art*, math.DG/0105041.
- [P] Papadopoulos, G., *Brane Solitons and Hypercomplex Structures*, math.DG/0003024 (published in the volume "Proceedings of the second meeting on "Quaternionic Structures in Mathematics and Physics", World Scientific, 2001).
- [PP] Pedersen, H., Poon, Y. S., *Inhomogeneous hypercomplex structures on homogeneous manifolds*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 516 (1999), 159-181.
- [V1] Verbitsky M., *Hyperholomorphic bundles over a hyperkähler manifold*, alg-geom electronic preprint 9307008 (1993), 43 pages, LaTeX, also published in: Journ. of Alg. Geom., **5** no. 4 (1996) pp. 633-669.
- [V2] Verbitsky M., *Hyperkähler embeddings and holomorphic symplectic geometry II*, a lg-geom electronic preprint 9403006 (1994), 14 pages, LaTeX, also published in: GAFA **5** no. 1 (1995), 92-104.
- [V3] Verbitsky M., *Deformations of trianalytic subvarieties of hyperkähler manifolds*, alg-geom electronic preprint 9610010 (1996), 51 pages, also published in: Selecta Math. (N.S.) 4 (1998), no. 3, 447-490.
- [V4] Verbitsky, M., *Hyperholomorphic connections on coherent sheaves and stability*, 40 pages, math.AG/0107182
- [V5] Verbitsky M., *Projective bundles over hyperkähler manifolds and stability of Fourier-Mukai transform*, math.AG/0107196 (2001), 60 pages.
- [V6] Verbitsky, M., *Hyperkähler manifolds with torsion, supersymmetry and Hodge theory*, math.AG/0112215, 47 pages (Asian J. of Math., Vol. 6 (4), December 2002).